

Remarks

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated April 8, 2003. Claims 1-8, 15-23, and 25-26 are currently pending. Claims 9-14 were previously canceled without prejudice and claim 24 has been canceled without prejudice in this amendment. New claims 25-26 have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 15-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,928,959 to Huckels et al. ("Huckels"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has cited no portion of Huckels that describes forming (1) a "semiconductor device having a DRAM including a cell capacitor formed in a DRAM region of a semiconductor substrate, and (2) a "capacitor element formed in an analog element region of the semiconductor substrate" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner stated at page 2 of the Office Action that "Huckels teaches a method comprising: a) simultaneously forming a storage node of the capacitor and lower electrode of the capacitor (Fig. 1 (161) and Col. 2, lines: 34-40) . . ." Huckels as cited by the Examiner, including Fig. 1 element 161 and col. 2, lines 34-40, appears to relate to a trench capacitor 160 formed in a DRAM cell 100. As seen in Huckels Fig. 1, the trench capacitor 160 is formed in the DRAM cell 100. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has cited no portion of Huckels that describes "a capacitor element formed in an analog element region of the semiconductor substrate." The Examiner appears to treat the "cell capacitor" of the DRAM and the "capacitor element" of the analog region as being the same, instead of being (1) "a cell capacitor" in a DRAM region of a semiconductor substrate, and (2) a separate "capacitor element" in an analog region of the semiconductor substrate.

As the "cell capacitor" and the "capacitor element" are separate structures formed at different locations, and the Examiner appears to cite the formation of a single capacitor structure formed in a single location in Huckels, it appears that the Examiner has cited no portion of the art that describes or suggests a method including the formation of a "cell capacitor" in a DRAM region and the formation of a "capacitor element" in an analog region, including "(a) simultaneously forming a storage node of the cell capacitor and a lower electrode of the capacitor element; (b) simultaneously forming a dielectric layer of the cell capacitor and a dielectric layer

of the capacitor element; and (c) simultaneously forming a cell plate of the cell capacitor and an upper electrode of the capacitor element" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as for claim 1. In addition to the reasons explained above for claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to Huckels do not describe or suggests all of the elements of claims 2-8. For example, claims 7-8 recite "wherein a silicide layer is formed in a region where the first resistance element is to be formed so that a resistance value of the first resistance element is lower than a resistance value of the second resistance element." The Examiner cited Huckels, col. 4, lines 40-60 and col. 4, lines 1-20. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations do no describe or suggest the formation of "a silicide layer . . . in a region where the first resistance element is to be formed" as recited in claim 8.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-23 are deficient for at least similar reasons as claim 1 as explained above and should be withdrawn for at least similar reasons as for claim 1. In addition, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's citations to Huckels do not describe or suggests the elements of claims 16-23.

Applicant has added new claims 25-26. It is believed that no new matter has been entered. Support for claims 25-26 may be found throughout the specification and Figures. Examination of the new claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes that it appears that the Examiner did not initial the U.S. patent applications cited on for PTO-1449 previously submitted by applicant. Applicant submitted copies of these applications with the other IDS papers and does not understand why they were not initialed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider these references and provide an indication that these references have been considered.

The Office Action also included various comments concerning the art and the non-patentability of features in various of the pending claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's non-patentability conclusions. The discussion above has directly addressed some of those comments and the Examiner's other comments are deemed moot at this time in view of this response.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, 15-23 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If, for any reason, the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss the steps necessary to place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan S. Raynor

Alan S. Raynes

Reg. No. 39,809

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Suite 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Customer No. 24033

Dated: July 8, 2003

(310) 556-7983 (tele general)
(310) 871-8448 (tele direct)
(310) 556-7984 (facsimile)

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 8, 2003.

Alan S. Raynes July 8, 2003
Alan S. Raynes (Date)